SOME NEW BOOKS.

A New Book About China.

Of the many works relating to the Middle Kingdom which have been published since the recent war in the far East, none is more trustworthy and valuable than the volume entitled *A Cycle of Cathay*, by W. A. P. MARTIN, D. D., LL. D. (New York, the Fleming H. Revell Co.) Dr. Martin went to China as a missionary forty-six years ago, and was first settled in Ningpo, where he not only acquired the dialect spoken in the province of Che-Kiang, but reduced it to writing in the Roman characters, so that his converts were able to read and write it. He also learned to read, write, and speak the mandarin or classical form of the Chinese language, which is spoken by the official and literary class all over the empire. It was this acquisition which caused him to be employed, in conjunction with Dr. Williams, as interpreter to the American legation in the negotiations for a treaty in 1858-59. The same remarkable qualification led ultimately to his employment by the Chinese Government as the President of the Imperial Tungwen College at Pekin, an institution founded for the purpose of training a corps of interpreters to be used in the foreign relations of the Middle Kingdom with European powers. His relatively thorough acquaintance with the languages and with the literature of China, his extensive travels in the Celestial Empire, and his wide and comparatively intimate acquaintance with Chinese statesmen combine to give uncommon value to his testimony upon all subjects connected with the history of China and with the actual political and social condition of the country. Nowhere can be found a more luminous sketch of Chinese history during the last four thousand years than is here compressed into a few pages; nowhere are the origin, character, and possibilities of the Taiping rebellion so intelligently described, and nowhere is there a clearer account of the mandarin system of government. We can here touch only a few of the most notable features of an interesting book which should be read from end to end.

I.

After learning the Ningpo colloquial dialect and reducing it to writing by means of the Roman alphabet, Dr. Martin applied himself to the study of the book-language, and spent five years in learning to read the nine chief works which form the basis of Chinese literature. It is well known that five of these classics relate to pre-Confucian times, that is, deal with the epoch prior to the sixth century B. C.; four, on the other hand, contain the teachings of Confucius and his disciples. During the five years devoted to the perusal of these works Dr. Martin began to employ the learned or classic language for the purpose of composition, and wrote in it a book on the Evidences of Christianity, which has been widely circulated and often reprinted, both in China and Japan. With regard to the so-called pidgin English, the *lingua franca* employed in the treaty ports as a substitute for Chinese, we are told that it grew up at Canton from the practice of learning English without a master—the little manuals prepared by the natives giving sounds incorrectly and syntax not at all. Some specimens are offered to help the reader to form an idea of it; of these we reproduce but one, a verse of Longfellow's "Excelsior," which will serve to show the adaptation of pidgin English to psalmody:

That nightee time begin chop-chop.
One young man walkee; no can stop.
Maskee de snow; maskee de ice!
He carry flag wid chop so nice—
Topside galow.

At Ningpo Dr. Martin began to study the effects of opium smoking, and he found it impossible to dismiss the subject as long as he remained in China. A Parliamentary Commission recently reported rather favorably on the use of the drug in India, but the conclusion to which Dr. Martin was brought is that to the Chinese the practice is an unmitigated curse. Whether it is more mischievous than the abuse of alcohol among Europeans he does not undertake to determine. The contrast between the effects of the two drugs is certainly remarkable. Alcohol makes a man noisy and furious; opium makes him quiet and rational. The drinker commits crime when he has too much; the opium smoker when he has too little. Drinking is a social vice and drunkenness a public nuisance; opium smoking is mostly a private vice, indulged at home, but, even in opium shops, it is more offensive to the nose than to the eye or ears. Alcohol imprints on the face a fiery glow; opium an ashy paleness. Alcoholic drinks bloat and fatten; opium emaciates. A drunkard may work well if kept from his cups; an opium smoker is good for nothing until he has had his pipe. A drunkard can in many, if not in most cases, cure himself by force of will; the opium habit is a disease to break from which requires in all cases the help of medicine. It needs years for alcohol to reduce a man to slavery; opium rivets its fetters in a few weeks or months. It does not take the place of tobacco, which, used by all classes as a more or less innocent indulgence, is indispensable to the opium smoker; nor does it take the place of alcoholic drinks, which are consumed as much as ever. Even the moderate use of opium unfits a man for most pursuits. Dr. Martin tells us that a thousand opium smokers were at one time dismissed from the Chinese army as disqualified for service. In the long run the insidious drug saps the strength, stupefies the mind, and of course shortens the span of life. Its expense to the consumer, though great in the aggregate, is nothing in comparison with the loss of time and energy sure to follow in its wake. These, of course, are general statements, subject to occasional exceptions. Dr. Martin has seen men sink into their graves in a few months from the use of the drug; he has known others to use it for thirty years, but not with impunity. An example of the latter sort was a man who entered the author's service at the age of fifty. He was active and faithful, but died in spite of medical care, because his stomach had become so tanned that it would no longer digest food or medicine. A Vice-Governor of Pekin told Dr. Martin that he had taken to the drug as an anodyne for grief at the loss of a child. Not long afterward he succumbed to a flux which might have been cured by opium, had he not been a smoker. Dr. Martin agrees with all other first-hand observers of men and things in China, and with all honest Englishmen, in pronouncing England responsible for the scourge which opium has proved to the Chinese, a scourge which it now seems impossible to check. On this point, he quotes with approval some extracts from a letter of Prince Kung: "The officials and people of this empire all say that England trades in opium because she desires to work China's ruin. For, say they, if the friendly feelings of England were genuine, since it is open to her to produce and trade in everything else, would she still insist on spreading the poison of this hurtful thing throughout this empire?" Having failed to obtain the coöperation of England in preventing imports of the noxious drug, the Chinese authorities were forced to license the growth of opium at home.

II.

In this book will be found one of the few intelligible accounts of Taoism accessible to Europeans. The word Tao signifies "way" and "truth" or "reason," and it professes to lead to everlasting "life," *i. e.*, a physical immortality. In the fountain head of Taoist philosophy, an ancient manual called *Tao-te-king*, a guide to "truth and virtue," is to be found the precept, "Repay injury with kindness." Its author, Li-rh, known as Laotse, the "old philosopher," because, though contemporary with Confucius, he was older, closed a studious, uneventful life in the sixth century B. C. The keeper of many books, being royal librarian, he wrote nothing that has been translated, except the little treatise above named, and the authorship of even that work is disputed. It is known, however, to have been extant in the third century B. C., and, as tradition uniformly ascribes it to him, and as, without it, we could scarcely account for his authority as the founder of a religion, we seem constrained to accept it as genuine. At all events, the seeds of Taoism are to be found in that book, which appears to be a collection of detached thoughts on the universe, human society, and self-government. Some of them are of surprising breadth and penetration, though, for the most part, they consist of vague generalities, destitute of logical connection or precision. So near, in thought and spirit, does the writer at times approach to Christianity, that some find in his writings traces of the Christian trinity. Dr. Martin cites, for example, Laotse's simple cosmogony: "One produced a second, the two produced a third, and the three produced all things." Again, he says, "there are three inscrutable things that blend in unity. The first is not the brightest nor the last the most obscure. Boundless in operation, there is no name to call them by." These three things are, however, not beings, but properties of Tao, the active principle of order in the universe. It seems that Laotse never rose to the conception of mind on the throne of the universe. Monism was the starting point of his system; one substance, matter, capable of evolving mind. He teaches, though not in express terms, the possibility of acquiring such a mastery over physical nature as to defy death and work miracles. From these obscure hints, taken in connection with the more ancient "Book of Changes," his disciples deduced the twin doctrines of the transmutation of metals and the elixir of life, thus originating the practice of alchemy many centuries before it found its way into Europe. Taoism was favored by the builder of the great wall, the great consolidator of China, the Emperor Ching, or Chin-Shi (240 B. C.), who butchered the followers of Confucius and burned their books. It was favored also by the founders of the following dynasty. But, with the resurrection of the classical books in the succeeding reigns, Confucianism again obtained ascendancy, and, in the first century of our era, another rival, Buddhism, appeared upon the scene. For a long time the three creeds waged a bitter war, alternately persecuting and persecuted, until, after the lapse of many centuries, they arrived at a *modus vivendi* by dividing between themselves the dominion of the three worlds; heaven being assigned to Buddhism, this world to Confucianism, and hell to Taoism. Buddhism, it is true, continues to make much of hell; but, in popular belief, the Taoist hierarch, or pope, has the control of demons. He lives on the Lunghu Mountain in Kiangsi, in a palace resembling that of an emperor, and his clergy have a monopoly of exorcism and witchcraft, constituting a vested interest in the superstitions of the people.

Lord Selborne's Recollections.

SECOND NOTICE.

If Roundell Palmer had never entered public life, he might have been made a Judge, but he would scarcely have become Lord Chancellor and a peer. His Parliamentary career began in 1847, when he was 35 years old. About this time he lived a good deal, when in London, in the society of some of his Oxford friends who took a keen interest in politics, and thereby his mind was drawn more than it had been before in that direction. Goldwin Smith, for instance, at that time full of gloomy forebodings of revolutionary changes in England, was a student in London, and the author tells us that "his company and conversation were, as always, delightful, and we were much together." Edward Cardwell, an old schoolfellow of Palmer's, had exchanged the bar for Parliament, where he at once made his mark. He was one of the Secretaries to the Treasury under Sir Robert Peel's Government, and was highly esteemed by that Minister. Cardwell, desiring for his friend a political career from his own love of it, and finding Palmer now more in agreement with his opinions than, perhaps, he had been before—for Palmer, like the Peelites, was dissatisfied with both the Liberal and the Protectionist leaders—frequently urged upon him to miss no good opportunity of getting into Parliament. The outcome of these influences was that, at the general election of 1847, he stood for Plymouth on a platform which committed him to the maintenance of the Established Church and against a repeal of the navigation laws, with regard to the abrogation of which, however, he now says that of all the political decisions of his time none has been more entirely justified by the results. He was returned by a substantial majority, and points out that the purity of the election was demonstrated by the fact that it did not cost him more than $3,000. Among the kind congratulations of his friends, he notes that Goldwin Smith wrote from Dresden: "It is very proper of you to try and abate our expectations. But they will be fulfilled; although, of course, you will at first be under great disadvantage in having to contend with men whose undivided attention is given to Parliament, and who come down to debate fresh from their club, while you will be wearied with your long day's work in court. Happily, your powers of endurance are great, though you sometimes overtask them."

I.

The Parliament elected in 1847 met for an autumn session, in the course of which Palmer made his maiden speech in the House of Commons. It was on some passing question relating to the natives of New Zealand. It is interesting to learn that the author had, even then, as always afterward he proved that he continued to have, a strong feeling as to the wrongs done in the name of civilization to those native races whom European colonists have dispossessed of their land. Our author was extremely sensitive, he tells us, to anything like a participation of Great Britain in such injustice, and the feeling made him impatient of all views of colonial policy which seemed to have an opposite tendency. It was in the spring of 1848 that the Jewish question, as to which Palmer had forborne to commit himself at Plymouth, was brought to an issue. Against the opinion of his father, which was shared by most good churchmen, he made up his mind that he must both speak and vote for the removal of Jewish disabilities, but the speech which he delivered in favor of the second reading of the Government measure on this subject was not an oratorical success. He spoke from notes; and, touching this method of speaking, he says: "I have never been in the habit of writing speeches; but, whenever I have had to speak on subjects of importance, I have generally worked out my thoughts on paper in the shape of notes more or less copious. The use of such notes by a public speaker makes his style of delivery less vigorous and effective than if he spoke without premeditation; but they insure accuracy and some logical order, for which I have always cared more than for the reputation of eloquence." Palmer met the argument that the Jews were aliens, having a peculiar nationality inconsistent with British citizenship, by showing that they were not, and never had been since they were tolerated, so regarded in law; and that their peculiar nationality was not a secular but a religious idea, and did not put them in a position at variance with any civil duties. As to the religious argument that it is a Christian duty to exclude Jews from the franchise, Palmer pointed out that the precepts of the New Testament are so far from encouraging the idea that Christians ought to avoid uniting themselves in political relations with non-Christians, that they are quite the other way: "If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men," &c.

Roundell Palmer applied in 1846 to Lord Lyndhurst for a "silk gown." He admits that it was an audacious thing to do, seeing that he was then of no more than nine years' standing at the bar, but he says that he was led to do it principally because Sir John Rolt, who was called to the bar on the same day with himself, had done so, and he wished, if possible, to keep pace with him, but partly also because the drudgery of preparing equity pleadings, often very voluminous, and requiring much manual labor, had become irksome. Palmer's strong preference, and, as he thought, real vocation, was for court work. Lord Lyndhurst gave Rolt the promotion which he asked for, but did not give it to Palmer. The latter good-naturedly opined that the Lord Chancellor was right as to both of them, for, though the two applicants were of the same standing at the bar, Rolt was several years the senior in point of years, and his business in 1846 was larger. Palmer renewed his application to Lord Cottenham at the end of 1848, when he was certainly one of the leading juniors of the equity bar, and when, moreover, his seat in Parliament was regarded as a make-weight in favor of the application. Our author received from Lord Cottenham his patent as Queen's Counsel in February, 1849, and, although some of his friends had misgivings about the wisdom of the step, his business, in point of fact, did not, even temporarily, decline. For the first two years he went into all the equity courts, and then fixed himself at the Rolls, in which court he soon found himself in undisputed possession of the lead, an important and lucrative professional position, which he retained till he became Solicitor-General.

In public affairs, during the session of 1849, Palmer's interest was largely concentrated on the proposal to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister. To this measure he was strongly opposed. He maintained that, apart from any religious conviction or sentiment, the harmony of the domestic relations of every family in the kingdom would be liable to be disturbed if the phrase "*sister-in-law*" were no longer to express a practical truth; if the intercourse of the wife, and of her husband and children after her death, with her sister in her husband's house should no longer remain upon the same footing as if the wife's sister were the husband's sister. For one case in which marriage with a wife's sister might be desired, Palmer thought that there would be thousands or tens of thousands in which it would not, and in which the existing very precious relation would be interrupted by considerations of prudence and of the world's opinion, if such a marriage were once permitted by law. He also showed not only that the doctrine of the primitive and the Roman Catholic churches as to the interpretation and the extent of the Levitical prohibition was the same as that of the English table of proscribed degrees, but that all the Protestant churches of the Continent and the Scotch Presbyterian churches were of the same mind, holding that the case of a deceased wife's sister should be within those prohibitions. It was true, he conceded, that the Roman Catholic Church has granted dispensations in this and some other cases within the Levitical prohibitions, and the Continental Protestant churches followed, in this respect, the usage of Rome. But in none of them could marriage with a deceased wife's sister take place without a dispensation till 1791, when a law was passed in Prussia legalizing generally all marriages for which dispensation might previously have been granted; *i. e.*, all within any of the degrees of affinity, and also between aunt and nephew, uncle and niece. Lord Selborne tells us that he has dwelt in his Recollections upon the part in this question which he took in 1849, and upon several later occasions, because his opinion upon it never varied. It is well known that the controversy has been a protracted one, and that during the last fifty-six years it has been annually renewed, and that this year a bill legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister passed the House of Lords and is almost certain to pass the Commons.

II.

In 1850-51 the Gorham case and the establishment by Pius IX. of a diocesan episcopacy for the government of the English Roman Catholics were the matters which mainly occupied the public mind in England. As early as May, 1849, Goldwin Smith had written to Palmer a letter describing the theological condition of Oxford at that time, which shows that the tendency to a rationalistic development there, which some have regarded as a consequence of the abolition of religious tests in 1854, had set in earlier. "At this moment," wrote Goldwin Smith, "Puseyism, though it is still living, looks dead, and, humanly speaking, stands in no small danger of becoming so, if we cannot soon fill up the void among its leaders. The general state of men's minds here is what you might naturally expect after a long period of fierce controversy. Torpor and apathy prevail. Even Froude's book ("The Nemesis of Fate") seems to have made no sensible impression. The better sort of men are turning to practical methods, new examination statutes, and university reforms. The worse sort are becoming more careless and more sensual. There are great fears and rumors of infidelity, which, from what I can learn, seem to be so far well founded that a certain number of men may be growing up not exactly in infidelity, but in the belief that Christianity is an open question. However, on the whole, I can see no reason to be otherwise than hopeful, provided that the young country clergy hold fast to the principles that they have carried away with them from this place, and that Puseyism here gets itself a leader or two. Pusey himself has said that 'life is too short for controversy,' and has shut himself up from the struggle. Mozley is a strong man morally and intellectually; I think him more so every time I see him; but in him there is something wanting, I know not what, to the leader of a religious movement. And religious movements, as well as social and political, unfortunately must have leaders." Such was the state of the theological atmosphere at the centre of controversy, when a new cause of excitement arose out of the Gorham Judgment early in 1850. The Court of Arches had decided in August, 1849, that the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Phillpotts) had shown sufficient cause for refusing to institute Mr. Gorham, a nominee of the Crown, to a living in his diocese, because that clergyman's doctrine on the subject of baptism was at variance with the formularies of the Church. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council reversed that judgment, but it was difficult to comprehend the grounds of their decision, and according to a saying of Roundell Palmer's, the Judges on the committee took their law from the Bishops, and the Bishops their divinity from the Judges. There was a widespread desire on the part of those who disapproved of this judgment that something should be done to counteract its effect, or at least to fortify the Court of Final Appeal in ecclesiastical cases, so as to enable any future decisions on doctrine to deserve and obtain the confidence of the Church at large. Accordingly, the Bishop of London introduced into the House of Lords a bill to enable or require the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to refer theological questions coming before them to the Bishops or other divines, as *experts*; but that bill was rejected by a large majority. Lord Selborne recalls that some of the most thoughtful members of the High Church party, whether satisfied or not with the reasons given for the judgment in the Gorham case, were not dissatisfied with the practical comprehensiveness which was its result. To exclude from the Church of England variations of doctrine and ecclesiastical terminology which had been tolerated in the whole Latin Church from the days of St. Augustine, and the condemnation of which would have condemned that Father himself, did not seem to such men as Mozley to be reasonably possible. These were considerations, however, which, while they might have weight with dispassionate minds, had little effect upon more impatient spirits. Many of those who had maintained their connection with the Anglican Communion in 1845, notwithstanding the example and arguments of Newman, now, or soon afterward, followed him into the Church of Rome, among them Archdeacons Manning and Robert Wilberforce, Henry Wilberforce and Thomas William Allies; also James Robert Hope and Edward Badeley, a learned lawyer, who had argued for the Bishop of Exeter before the Privy Council.

The excitement consequent upon these events was inflamed in the autumn of the same year (1850), when Pius IX. issued his Letters Apostolic establishing a diocesan episcopacy for the future ecclesiastical government of English Catholics, and, for that purpose, divided England into dioceses. This so-called Papal aggression drew from the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, a sensational letter which served as a signal for popular demonstrations all over the country. Roundell Palmer was one of those who did not think that any legislation was called for in the circumstances. He voted against the Ecclesiastical Titles bill, introduced by Lord John Russell, and spoke against it on the second reading. This was, he tells us, the first great debate in which he had addressed the House, and he spoke with more freedom and confidence than usual. Although he was one of a minority of ninety, consisting chiefly of Peelites and Irish Roman Catholics, he seems to have achieved one of those successes for which important discussions of questions of principle sometimes give opportunity to men not in the front rank of politics. The bill, it is well known, was passed, but its impotence and failure verified to the full the arguments which had been used against it, and some years afterward it was repealed without a dissentient voice. Palmer's vote on this bill, however, gave offence to his intensely Protestant constituents at Plymouth, and caused him, as we shall see, to lose for a brief time his seat for that borough.

III.

In the summer of 1850 Sir Robert Peel died. Lord Selborne tells us that he had learned to admire and respect him very much, and further experience of public life after his death only increased that respect. "In versatility and brilliancy," says the author of these recollections, "he (Peel) has been surpassed by other statesmen of this century; in measured and equable judgment, by none. He preferred the interest of his country to his party as well as to himself; which not many others of our great men have done. It was due, perhaps, to his training at the Home Office that he understood and interested himself in all departments of administration and attended to measures which did not appeal to popular sentiment or imagination as well as to those which did. In this respect he excelled all his rivals and all his successors." His death made the position of those who had continued to acknowledge him as their leader after the disruption of the Conservative party, consequent upon the repeal of the Corn laws, very difficult; and when, at the beginning of the session of 1852, the Ministry of Lord John Russell fell, and Lord Derby became Premier, it was unavoidable that the Peelites, as they were called, should reconsider their relations both to the party of which they had been formerly members and to the Reformers or Liberals whom they had formerly opposed. There was much diversity of opinion among the Peelites as to the attitude to be assumed by them toward Lord Derby's Ministry; a few of them (Lord Mahon, afterward Earl Stanhope, was the most considerable) became general supporters of that Government. The majority, desiring to maintain for the time being a distinct position, included several who, like Roundell Palmer, and also apparently Gladstone, would have preferred to avoid a final breach with the Conservative party, and not to go into declared opposition. There was no fear in any quarter of any attempt to restore protection; and as that was the only question by which the Conservative party had been divided, tact and good management upon the part of Sir Robert Peel's followers might have restored its unity upon the same liberal basis on which Peel originally consolidated it. With this end in view, Palmer wrote to Cardwell in February, 1852, suggesting that the Peelites should preserve their Conservative character and keep on as good terms as they could with the whole moderate section of the then existing Conservative party in the House and in the country. Were this done, his belief was that the leading influence over the mass of moderate and rational conservatism would revert to the Peelites immediately on Lord Derby's failure. The letter was shown by Lord Cardwell to Gladstone, and also to the Duke of Newcastle; but the policy which Palmer advocated did not prevail. It might, perhaps, he tells us in this book, have prevailed, "if Lord Derby alone had been concerned, though no confidence was felt in him, but Disraeli was his Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the resentment against Disraeli for the envenomed attacks on Peel, by which he had gained his position, knew no bounds. Each man, however, was at liberty, within certain limits, to act according to his own judgment, and my judgment was to maintain my own independence, while doing nothing to break off my connection with the party of which Sir James Graham, Sidney Herbert, and Gladstone were the leaders in the House of Commons, and to vote with Lord Derby's Government, except when I thought them wrong."

This independent attitude, coupled with his obnoxious vote on the Ecclesiastical Titles bill, caused Palmer to lose his seat at the general election in 1852. The contest cost him, he tells us, nearly twice as much money as either of his other elections had cost, without any improper expenditure, yet, at the last moment, he was forced to retire from the field. The successful candidate, however, was unseated for bribery in 1853, and Palmer again became member for Plymouth, retaining that position till the dissolution of 1857.

IV.

In 1854 Roundell Palmer came near attaining, as, indeed, he did twice afterward, the honor of representing the University of Oxford in Parliament. The time was a critical one for Oxford. The three preceding years had been occupied by the work of a Royal Commission (of which A. P. Stanley and Goldwin Smith were secretaries), appointed in 1850, to inquire into the University and colleges. Upon its report a bill was introduced on March 18, 1854, by Lord John Russell, and the Convocation of the University when called together to petition against it did so by a majority of two only; which, considering the Conservative, and, to a large extent, clerical composition of that body, threw its moral weight into the Reform scale. Gladstone's influence, which was exerted in favor of the measure, was powerful, and the second reading passed unopposed. In the later stages of the bill, two questions of principle arose. The bill contained no saving clause in favor of schools connected with colleges; and there was nothing in it as to religious tests or for the admission of Dissenters to the University. Upon the former of those subjects, Palmer moved in committee, and carried against the Government, a clause enabling the governing body of any school having the privilege or right of preference as to places on the foundation of a college, to put a veto on any regulation for its abolition by a two-thirds majority. The case which Palmer chiefly had in view was that of New College and Winchester, in which school, as a Wykehamist, he took great interest; and he was able to show, from the annals of New College, that, as long as its fellows, elected, as they were, exclusively from Winchester, were on equal terms with those of other colleges, no college had been more distinguished, whether tried by the test of university prizes or that of eminence in after life. If, during the earlier part of the present century, such a comparison might have been less in their favor, this was due, so Palmer argued, to a privilege of exemption from university examination, which privilege became injurious to them when those examinations were tests of merit opening the way to honors, and which, after some experience of that mischief, they had renounced. Besides Winchester, there were other schools connected with particular colleges, for instance, Westminster with Christ Church, and Merchant Taylors' School with St. John's; there were a few others of less importance, which furnished Palmer's opponents with their principal arguments. In the House of Lords, some qualifications were introduced in the Palmer clause by the Government which he thought undesirable, though they did not prevent it from operating as a valuable safeguard. The other question, as to the abolition of religious tests with a view to the admission of Dissenters to the University, was brought forward in the House of Commons through an amendment moved by Mr. Heywood. The motion was not only supported by Lord John Russell and the Whigs, who probably would have cared but little about any measure of university reform which did not deal with that question, but also by Lord Stanley from the Conservative benches, who intimated that, if the House agreed to the motion, they need not fear the House of Lords, where his father, Lord Derby, was then supreme. Roundell Palmer opposed the motion, not because he had any love for the particular tests of the Thirty-nine Articles, as applied to lads of 13, fresh from school, or, indeed, as applied to anybody, but for the following reasons: "I could not help knowing," he writes, "that, on the part of the very young, the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles meant practically, not assent to dogma, but submission to authority; and that, in all cases, its effect was to place under restraint in the university tendencies of opinion which might otherwise have been at open war with the Church, not to say with Christianity. This, as a Christian and a churchman, I could but regard as a positive good, not to be surrendered because the particular means by which it was attained might not be theoretically the best." Lord Selborne goes on to disclaim any unwillingness to confer upon Dissenters any benefit which they could receive without detriment to the university and the Church; but he could not, he says, accept the argument that because the universities were national they should cease to be connected with the national Church, as they had been at all periods in their history, deriving from that connection most of their foundations and emoluments. He deemed that connection a public benefit, offering, as it did, to the clergy of the Established Church a liberal education, with powerful safeguards for those religious influences without which it might be useless to them or worse. In a word, to convert the universities into places of mere secular learning would be, he thought, to destroy their uses and character. It is well known that Palmer's opposition was unavailing; the motion for the abolition of religious tests was carried by a large majority, and Lord Stanley was proved to have been a true prophet when he hinted that the vote would not be reversed in the House of Lords. At present, Dissenters are admissible to the English universities, not only for matriculation, but for all degrees except that of doctor in divinity.

V.

Roundell Palmer was not one of those Englishmen who thought the Crimean war just and necessary. He had no hatred or fear of Russia, and no belief in the possibility of arresting the decay of Turkey. In this respect he shared the opinions expressed by John Henry Newman. In Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet the Premier himself, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Gladstone represented the interest of peace. They stood practically alone, however, even their fellow Peelites, the Duke of Newcastle and Sidney Herbert, being unfriendly to Russia. Lord Palmerston, with all the vigor of his character; Lord John Russell, with some vacillation, and Lord Clarendon, the Foreign Secretary, with more evident reluctance, supported the pro-Turkish views so vehemently advocated by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, then Ambassador at Constantinople. In such a Cabinet, Lord Aberdeen was unable to control the course of events, and he eventually yielded to the necessity which he had desired to avert. When, however, the successes of the allied army were followed by the miserable winter campaign of 1854-55, and public indignation was aroused by the shortcomings of the British commissariat, it was upon Lord Aberdeen and his friends that the storm fell, and Lord Palmerston, as the true representative of the war policy, naturally became the head of the Government. The Peelites now resumed an independent position, in which, Lord Selborne tells us, he sympathized with them much more than when they were reponsible for the war. We note that in May, 1855, Roundell Palmer argued against the demand that Sebastopol should be taken before terms of peace, otherwise reasonable, could be entertained; he also objected to the condition that Russia and Turkey should each be limited to four ships of war in the Black Sea. "Such a limitation," he contended, "would be ignominious to Russia; if compelled to accept it now she would always be looking for an opportunity of striking off her fetters. It was wise policy when negotiating a peace with a powerful adversary to consider his honor as well as our own." Palmer went on to maintain that if England waited till Sebastopol was taken the points previously contended for would not satisfy the war party; the circle of objects to be insisted upon would be constantly enlarged; while, if Russia were driven to fight for her altars and her fires, the war might be long and its results disastrous. All these arguments were in vain. The war went on, and before long Sebastopol was taken. If Palmer's fears, however, as to what might then happen were not realized, it was not because the war party in England had become reasonable and moderate, but because the French Emperor had got what he wanted. He had played on the stage of Europe the part of a great military potentate, and had gained some of the glory in which France delights. Peace now suited his interests better than war, but Russia, after her defeat, was obliged to accept some humiliating terms, including the limitation of the number of her ships of war in the Black Sea. It is well known that the consequences were those which Roundell Palmer had foretold in 1855. Fifteen years afterward, when France was engaged in her deadly struggle with Germany, Russia shook off the restriction placed on her naval power in the Black Sea, and the other powers by a diplomatic act formally ratified the abrogation of that article of the treaty of Paris.

Early in 1856 Roundell Palmer had occasion to express his opinion in Parliament upon a question as to which men's minds are still divided, that of opening national institutions to the public on Sundays. On Feb. 21 of the year named a motion was made in the House of Commons to open the British Museum and the National Gallery on Sunday. It was supported by Lord Stanley, whose reputation as an independent thinker added weight to his opinion. Roundell Palmer thought it a duty to answer it, and, without entering into the theological question, stated his conviction that, great as were the physical and economical advantages (which nobody called in question) of the weekly day of rest, the moral benefit was still greater; he contended that the consecration of the day withdrew men once a week from the contemplation of secular and earthly things, and invited them with a call which every man must hear, though all might not regard, to remember their eternal interests, to recollect that they were spiritual beings with immortal souls, and that this world, its pleasures, its labors, its objects, and its gains, were not the only things for which they were born. If the law of the land, he proceeded to argue, did not interfere, the pressure of competition, the pressure of war, and the pressure of power between man and man would be so great that, although some might and would resist it, many others would not and could not. Considering the poverty of many of that class whose interests had been chiefly dwelt upon in the debate, the families which they had to maintain, and the difficulty with which they ate the bread of care and labor, Roundell Palmer thought that much more effective arguments might be constructed for allowing them to labor on Sunday in their different callings, for additional bread, than any of those offered in favor of intellectual recreation and amusements. He referred to the experience of France and other countries, in which more than half the shops were open and in which elections and reviews took place on Sundays, there being no protection at all for the laborer and no such thing as a day of rest; not as wishing to make boastful comparisons between Frenchmen and Englishmen, but because it was simple common sense to inquire into the working of the principle of relaxation where it had been tried, and had produced its natural fruits. Palmer met the argument founded on things already permitted, by observing, first, that in all such questions, there must always be a debatable ground; a line must be drawn somewhere, which could not be drawn with perfect theoretical accuracy, but there was no great practical harm done, as long as the line was drawn so as neither to offend nor corrupt the public conscience; secondly, by pointing out the difference between the sphere of public and of private action. He asserted that he did not place less value than did Lord Stanley upon mental cultivation; but he thought its value depended upon its due subordination to moral improvement. The devil, he said, had been defined as intellect without principle, and, for his own part, he thought that anything which tended to impede morals for the sake of intellectual improvement was as mischievous as the due cultivation of the intellect was good. Roundell Palmer's conclusion was that "there was a higher mode of educating the mind and the consciences of men, of elevating the moral sense of the nation, than the multiplication of means of intellectual improvement. That mode was to hold up to them, and to keep before them, firmly and consistently, by public authority, a standard of sound moral principle by which they ought to abide, and that the law which upholds the institution of the Christian Sabbath does more to educate and maintain a sound moral sense in a Christian people than all the museums and picture galleries in the world." The motion to open the British museums was rejected by a majority of 328; nor, up to the date of Lord Selborne's death, did motions of the same character find much favor even in the House of Commons, where the feelings and interests of the working classes are more directly represented than in the House of Lords.

VI.

The accession of Lord Palmerston to office in the spring of 1859, after the defeat of Lord Derby's second administration, was the turning point in Gladstone's career, and every one will hear with interest what Roundell Palmer has to say concerning him. He begins by pointing out that, of all Peel's followers, Gladstone had been the most hostile to Lord Palmerston. At the election for Flintshire in 1857 he canvassed with great energy for his brother-in-law, Sir Stephen Glynne, the Conservative candidate, going about the country and exhausting the resources of his eloquence in condemnation of Lord Palmerston as a man most unfit to govern England. From the autumn of 1856 to the day on which the Derby Ministry of 1858-59 fell, his mind appeared to incline toward reunion with the Conservatives. Twice in the autumn of 1856 Palmer heard from Arthur Gordon (son of Lord Aberdeen) that Gladstone had decided on taking that course, whatever others might do; then again came the intimation that he had changed his mind. The session of 1857 was remarkable for a long Parliamentary duel between him and Bethel, afterward Lord Westbury, over the Divorce bill, in which Bethel was victorious, and by which Gladstone was more than ever alienated from the Whig Government. He took part in the vote that overthrew Lord Palmerston, and in November, 1858, he accepted from Lord Derby a mission to the Ionian Islands, which some time afterward resulted in their cession to Greece. When he returned from that mission, in March, 1859, he was in very great favor with the Conservatives. Lord Selborne says that he remembers well a conversation about him with Sir Hugh Cairns, who was full of his praise. There never was a time, the author thinks, at which the Conservative party was better disposed toward reconciliation with Gladstone. He voted with them on an important occasion. Nevertheless, when the Duke of Newcastle, Sidney Herbert, Lord Elgin and Cardwell agreed to serve under Lord Palmerston, Gladstone also took office as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Whether, in so doing, he was influenced by attachment to those friends or by the natural desire of a man conscious of great powers to turn them to account, Lord Selborne does not pretend to know. Whatever may have been the reason, it determined Gladstone's course for the rest of his public life. There was at that time between him and Lord Palmerston at least one point of agreement, their common sympathy with the cause of the Italian revolution. But, in our author's opinion, this was not enough to produce cordial relations between men of such very opposite character and of views so different on most subjects. Lord Palmerston, indeed, was a man of the world. He bore no grudge against those who had opposed him, and was easily reconciled to those whom he had himself opposed. In Gladstone's case it was otherwise. Lord Selborne's belief is that to the end they disliked and distrusted each other, and that their union in 1859 was only one of convenience on both sides; to Lord Palmerston, who wanted Gladstone's help; and to Gladstone, who was looking to the future.

In a later chapter Roundell Palmer recognizes that Gladstone, after taking office in 1859, became a greater political power than before. By his financial scheme of 1860, and the speech in which he introduced it, he made an impression on the country which was never effaced. On the other hand, by the heat and imperious tone toward the House of Lords which he exhibited on the occasion of their throwing out his bill for the repeal of the paper duties (it is not disputed by Lord Selborne that on the merits of that question Gladstone was right and they were wrong), his moral attitude toward the parties which divided the State was changed. Men ceased by degrees to look upon him as representing Conservative principles in a Liberal Cabinet. The group of statesmen who had accompanied him from Oxford into public life, to most of whom he was attached by personal friendships, and who had received their political education under Sir Robert Peel, had passed, or were rapidly passing, away. Gladstone, therefore, was now virtually alone. He chafed at the continual contests recurring at every election for Oxford, of which he had to bear the brunt, and at the difficulty of making all that he said and did intelligible to such difficult constituents. As long as he remained member for the university he seemed to be halting between two opinions. Lord Palmerston and others of his colleagues were glad of this, the restraints of which Gladstone was impatient being their best security against a temperament with which few of them were in sympathy, and an ambition which some of them feared. It was in these circumstances that, early in 1861, a belief arose at Oxford that Gladstone was about to retire from the representation of the University, to offer himself for South Lancashire; thereupon some of Roundell Palmer's friends proposed to urge him for the vacant seat. Nothing came of this matter at the time; Gladstone did not retire, or go to South Lancashire until he had been rejected by the university at the next general election.

VII.

The death of Lord Campbell in June, 1861, caused a number of changes in the law offices of the Crown, and the post of Solicitor-General was offered to Roundell Palmer. He stipulated that he was to be free on the church rate and wife's-sister questions, and, an agreement to this effect having been reached, a seat was found for him in Parliament, where he had not sat since 1857. Through the influence of Lord Zetland he was elected for Richmond in Yorkshire, with no other drawback than a fit of gout, which obliged him, when he took his seat, to enter the House of Commons on crutches. It is this part of Roundell Palmer's life which is of peculiar interest to Americans, because, as Solicitor-General, and, later, as Attorney-General, he had much to do with the enforcement of the neutrality laws during our civil war. It happened in 1864, when he was Attorney-General, that he thought it his duty, in the case of the Confederate prize, called Tuscaloosa, which had been brought into the waters of the Cape Colony by her captor, the Alabama, to suggest as a question for the consideration of the Government whether a vessel brought in such circumstances into a British port (from which the prizes of both belligerents were by the Queen's proclamation excluded) ought not to be detained, with a view to her restoration to her original owners, if properly reclaimed by them. The Duke of Newcastle, then Colonial Secretary, acted upon this suggestion, and a step was taken in consequence of it when the Tuscaloosa herself returned, without any previous warning, to the Cape of Good Hope, which considerations of good faith toward the parties in possession of that particular ship obliged the Government to retract. This led to an attack upon the Government in the House of Commons, and, although the motion of censure was defeated by a majority of 34, it was impossible to deny that a mistake had been made. It seems that Lord Westbury (Richard Bethell, then Lord Chancellor) sent, on that occasion, for Roundell Palmer and the Solicitor-General, and gave them a lecture on the duty of the law officers to confine themselves to questions of law, without meddling with politics.

Lord Selborne has some interesting paragraphs with regard to the division of opinion in England upon the merits of the question between the Northern and the Southern States. He points out that those who were governed mainly by sentiment—and they were many in all classes, especially in the artisan class of the manufacturing districts, the greatest sufferers by the war—regarded the issue as one between freedom and slavery. All these, and others friendly to democratic institutions, who thought that their success or failure in the New World might be at stake, took sides with the North. The influence of that feeling was neutralized in others, to many of whom slavery was not less odious, by the fact that slavery had been, from the first, allowed by the Constitution of the United States. Many English politicians then regarded the Federal Union as a voluntary compact between sovereign States, and not as establishing between the Federal Government and each State the relation between sovereign and subject. From that point of view the contract seemed to be dissoluble at will whenever any number of States, sufficient in power and importance to make civil war the alternative, might think it for their interests to withdraw. There was also in some quarters a disposition to sympathize with any insurrection of which political independence was the object. Many Liberals had that bias; Lord Selborne suggests that this may be the explanation of the celebrated speech in which Mr. Gladstone prematurely congratulated Mr. Jefferson Davis on having created a nation. Conservatives generally were not under the influence of that sort of sympathy; but large numbers of them appeared to think the right of insurrection inherent in the members of a democratic confederation which had originally established its own independence by insurrection against the British Government. Other Conservatives thought it might be for the advantage of the world that a power so vast as the United States seemed likely to become should be divided, and that in the Northern as well as the Southern half of the American continent there should be a number of independent nations capable of balancing each other. Lord Selborne recalls that these various shades of opinion existed in the country, in Parliament, and within the Cabinet itself. In the House of Commons, as well as elsewhere, Liberals who had not the responsibilities of office, like Mr. Roebuck, for example, supported the Southern cause, while without committing themselves absolutely to the seceders, the Conservative Opposition as a body seemed to lean to that side, so far, at least, as to embarrass the Government in the measures taken to prevent the violation of England's neutrality. Lord Selborne confirms what we have learned on other authority, that "the influence of France was thrown into the same scale; its Emperor would have recognized the independence of the Southern Confederation, even when the war was at its height, if he could have prevailed upon our Government to join him in doing so." Loans were negotiated in England for the Confederates, and an active trade was carried on by English shipowners and manufacturers in the supply to both parties of munitions of war. According to Lord Selborne, no international law required and no municipal law enabled the British Government to prevent these things; but he records the well-known fact that the irritation of the Government and people of the United States at those practical evidences of sympathy with the Confederacy was great.

VIII.

Lord Selborne protests that, for his own part, he was not governed at all by sentiment in the view which he took of these matters. He writes: "My feeling was, as it has always been, friendly toward the United States, and, on the merits of the controversy, my opinion was that the quarrel had been forced upon them by the South without sufficient cause, and that the former were within their rights in resisting the dismemberment of the Union." He considers, however, that his duty was to advise his own Government as to the rights and obligations of neutrality with perfect impartiality as between the combatants; and that this duty he performed dispassionately seems evident from the fact that partisans on both sides were dissatisfied. With regard to the Trent affair, Lord Selborne says that, if the United States Government had not yielded to England's remonstrance and restored to liberty the prisoners taken from that neutral mail steamer, this would certainly have been treated as a *casus belli*. Lord Selborne is mistaken, however, in asserting that nothing of the kind had ever been done before. The United States had gone to war with England in 1812 for no other reason than because England claimed the right to seize British subjects whenever they were found on neutral vessels. It is true that this claim had not been revived after the end of that war, and that, in 1861, there was no British statesman who was not ready to acknowledge that it was untenable. But who gave British statesmen the right to make and unmake, at their option, principles of international law? In the Trent affair Capt. Wilkes did precisely what British naval Captains had done repeatedly during the years preceding 1812, and what had never been disavowed or repudiated by the British Government. It is true that Capt. Wilkes decided the question for himself in a summary manner at sea, but this was precisely the way in which British Captains had decided it. Unquestionably Capt. Wilkes, when he visited the Trent, had as much right to take from her American citizens as British naval officers had ever had to take British subjects from American vessels.

With regard to the case of the Alabama, Lord Selborne acknowledges that this vessel escaped seizure in England when evidence justifying its seizure was in the possession of the British Government. The miscarriage of duty occurred through what is admitted to have been a breach of duty through an unfortunate delay at a critical moment. On the other hand, Lord Selborne denounces as wilful detractors of his country those who assert that the facts as to that ship were, at the time, open and notorious, so as to make evidence needless. As a matter of fact, six depositions regarding the character and destination of the Alabama were placed in the hands of the Collector of Customs at Liverpool on July 21, 1862. On the 28th of the same month the Alabama went out of dock, and at daybreak on the following day left the Mersey. Lord Selborne, then Solicitor-General, assures us that he knew nothing about the depositions until late in the afternoon of July 28, when he met the Attorney-General, by the latter's appointment. "We then read," he says, "and considered the evidence, and recommended that the ship should be seized without further delay." Their report was in Lord Russell's hands early the next day, and orders were immediately sent down to Liverpool for her seizure; but, of course, in the mean time she was gone. It is not only easy, as Lord Selborne puts it, but it is entirely just to say that it was a grievous error on the part of the British Government not to send orders to the Collector at Liverpool to detain the Alabama during the interval between July 22 and the receipt, seven days thereafter, of the opinion of the law officers upon the depositions forwarded. No excuse for this error is admissible, nor was any such admitted by the arbitrators who gave judgment in the Alabama case.

These recollections bring us only to 1865, leaving a quarter of a century of the author's life unchronicled. We infer, from the preface, that Lord Selborne's daughter, Lady Sophia Palmer, is engaged in preparing a supplement to the present work. Cut short, as they are at an important stage of the author's public life, these capacious volumes, comprising, as we have said, about a thousand pages, embody a vast amount of first-hand and authentic testimony bearing on the history of England from 1845 to 1865. No public library, and no private library, with any pretensions to historical completeness, can afford to be without such a repository of information. M. W. H.

MEN OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS.

A Convention of Their Association to Be Held in Boston.

A Convention of the National Association of Newsdealers, Booksellers, and Stationers, of which Mr. Michael Moy of Providence, R. I., is the President, is to be held in Boston on Oct. 6 and 7. The delegates to it are to be chosen by local bodies throughout the country, and must present their credentials before admission. According to the official notice, a measure has been prepared for presentation which will help the members of the association to deal directly with publishers, to the satisfaction of both parties. Among the other important questions to be brought before the Convention, four may be mentioned: "The formation of an alliance of publishers for mutual advantage;" "the adoption of measures to meet the competition of the department stores;" "the methods by which our postal laws may be improved," and "suggestions toward a better system of organization." The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the association is Mr. T. J. Quinn, whose headquarters are at Trainor's Hotel, this city.